

STATE OF MICHIGAN
COURT OF APPEALS

In the Matter of S.T., S.T., and R.T. III, Minors.

DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN SERVICES,

Petitioner-Appellee,

v

RALPH TURNER, JR.,

Respondent-Appellant.

UNPUBLISHED
February 19, 2008

No. 280253
Monroe Circuit Court
Family Division
LC No. 06-019479-NA

Before: Talbot, P.J., and Cavanagh and Zahra, JJ.

MEMORANDUM.

Respondent appeals as of right from an order terminating his parental rights to the minor children pursuant to MCL 712A.19b(3)(c)(i), (c)(ii), (g), and (j). We affirm. This appeal is being decided without oral argument pursuant to MCR 7.214(E).

The trial court did not clearly err when it found clear and convincing evidence establishing the statutory grounds for termination of respondent's parental rights. See MCR 3.977(J); *In re Sours*, 459 Mich 624, 633; 593 NW2d 520 (1999). When the original petition was filed, it was alleged that respondent (1) did not provide proper or necessary support for the minor children, (2) had a criminal and violent history that impeded his ability to care for the minor children, and (3) did not have stable housing for the minor children. Respondent was ordered to comply with the requirements of a case service plan, but he did not do so, was incarcerated much of the time that the minor children were in temporary care, and made no efforts to work on the service plan when he was not incarcerated.

At the time of the termination trial, respondent testified that it would take six months or a year for him to be ready to parent the children. Further, respondent had significant issues involving alcohol and drugs, which apparently caused him to become violent and aggressive. It appeared that some of his criminal activity resulted from this. While respondent testified that he loved his children, and the trial court believed that he did, the court was rightly concerned that respondent's actions were not those of a concerned parent. Respondent demonstrated no understanding of the negative impact his actions would have on the young children. Although respondent did care for the minor children for a brief period of time in their mother's absence, he did not show any serious interest in the children, never provided any financial, physical, or

emotional support for the minor children, and did not appear to be in any position to do so at the time of the termination trial.

The trial court also did not err in its best interests determination. See MCL 712A.19b(5); *In re Trejo*, 462 Mich 341, 353-354; 612 NW2d 407 (2000). The court considered the entire record and could not find that it would be contrary to the best interests of the minor children to terminate respondent's parental rights. Respondent did not have a bond with any of the minor children, had not consistently visited with them, and only the oldest child knew who he was and asked about him. The minor children were young, and they were entitled to grow up in a stable and safe environment, something respondent could not provide for them.

Affirmed.

/s/ Michael J. Talbot
/s/ Mark J. Cavanagh
/s/ Brian K. Zahra